

# THE LIFE OF THE SPIRIT

---

Vol. XV

DECEMBER 1960

No. 174

---

## CONTENTS

EDITORIAL		240
MESSIANIC FULFILMENT IN ST LUKE	Edmund Hill	240
THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN CONTEMPORARY JEWISH THOUGHT	A. I. Polack	250
A NOTE ON 'THE JEWS' OF ST JOHN	Jordan Vink	258
THE HOLY NAME	A.K.R.	260
CAMPION'S MISSION	Charles Somerville	263
ST AMBROSE, A CONTEMPLATIVE	Pax	269
GAMALIEL (A Conversation)		272
REVIEWS		279
MUSIC		285

---

Contributors are encouraged to submit original MSS. or translations from the Fathers. *Literary Communications* to be addressed to The Editor, *The Life of the Spirit*, Blackfriars, Cambridge (Tel. 51514). The Editor cannot be responsible for the loss of MSS. submitted, and no MS. will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope. *Subscriptions, Orders* and *Communications* regarding *Advertisements* should be addressed to the Manager, Blackfriars Publications, 34 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1 (Museum 5728). Annual Subscription 30s. 6d. (\$4.50) post free. *Binding: Orders* and *Enquiries* for binding volumes of the review may be sent to the Kemp Hall Bindery, 33 St Aldate's, Oxford.

## EDITORIAL

I THINK that this is perhaps the first LIFE OF THE SPIRIT which has contained an article by a Jewish contributor. The theme of the number formed also the theme of a conference of Catholics and Jews held at Spode House last June. In these ecumenically minded days, I am sure readers will agree, it is just as important for Christians and Jews to try and understand one another, and to learn how to talk to each other about their religious beliefs, as it is for Catholics and Protestants to discuss their differences, and try at least to find a common language.

The figure of the Messiah, that is the Christ, is clearly the central point where Christianity and Judaism touch each other, and diverge. In this review, of course, we are concerned with Catholic, not with Jewish, readers. But we have no doubt that being well informed about Jewish messianic ideas should help Catholics to a better appreciation of the messianic character of their own religion, which means a better understanding of the person of our Lord, and of what it really means when with St Peter we make our profession of faith to Jesus that 'thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'.

MESSIANIC FULFILMENT IN ST LUKE'S GOSPEL<sup>1</sup>

EDMUND HILL, O.P.

ST LUKE dedicates his gospel to Theophilus, a man of some rank, it would seem, and tells him that his intention is to help him 'recognize the solid grounds of the instruction he had received' (i, 4). To appreciate his gospel to the full, then, we need to have some sort of idea about what instruction Theophilus *had* received. If we assume that he had received much the same sort of instruction as all other first generation converts of the apostles and their followers—and it seems a reasonable enough assumption to go on, until the contrary is proved—then it is possible to form some idea of what it consisted of from the

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the Spode House Conference of Catholics and Jews, June 1960.



Acts of the Apostles. Instruction (*catechesis*) would naturally follow on and amplify preaching or evangelization (*kerygma*); and from the various speeches of the apostles given in the Acts we gather that the cardinal points of their preaching were as follows: (1) to show that Jesus is the Christ, that is that he fulfils the *expected*, prophetic, messianic requirements—'therefore let all the house of Israel know that God made him both Lord and Christ (Messias), this Jesus whom *you* crucified' (Acts ii, 36); (2) to show that the Christ must suffer and rise again, and salvation must be preached to the gentiles in his name—'I have stood bearing witness to both little and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would happen, that the Christ by suffering, by being the first of the resurrection of the dead would proclaim light to the people and the gentiles' (*ib.*, xxvi, 23).

This second series of points was, of course, by no means *expected*—it was precisely the burning controversial issue, the wholly *unexpected* thing about the gospel. It could only be proposed to people's belief, and defended from the prophets, if people were first convinced that Jesus was the *expected* Christ, or Messias. The whole programme is summed up in the following text, 'and for three sabbaths running he argued with them from the scriptures, explaining and proposing that the Christ had to suffer and rise from the dead, and that "this is the Christ, Jesus whom I proclaim to you"' (*ib.*, xvii, 3). This basic point—proving that Jesus is the Christ—could only be made, presumably, by pointing to the *expected*, conventional messianic signs in his life; these would be his credentials.

It is not unreasonable to suppose that apostolic instruction was modelled on Jesus' own method of teaching. On the evidence of the gospels he first satisfied his disciples that he was the Christ—he led up to Peter's confession of faith at Caesarea Philippi. Only after that did he go on to tell them that the son of man must suffer many things. . . . Not that they believed him even then (cf. Luke xxiv, 25-6, 46).

Now Luke, according to his own prologue, is giving Theophilus the evidence, that is, the solid grounds for the instruction he had received; the evidence therefore for the messianic credentials of Jesus first of all, and then for his teaching on the controversial *unexpected* heart of the gospel. But in this article we will only be concerned with the evangelist's substantiation of the

claim that 'Jesus is the Christ', not with the claim that 'the Christ must suffer, and rise again, and salvation be preached in his name to the gentiles'.

What then were the current messianic expectations that Jesus, according to St Luke—and indeed the rest of the new testament—fulfilled, in order to 'prove' himself to be the Christ? I think we can agree with the Jewish scholar Joseph Klausner, in his book *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, that there were four main pictures of the hoped for Messiah which had been gradually built up by the whole Israelite tradition of the old testament, pictures that were on the face of it by no means always consistent with each other.

(1) The first was of the glorious, mighty, triumphant Christ who would conquer the oppressor gentile nations—of a Christ who was the projection into the future of the Davidic victories and Solomonian splendours of the past (cf. Pss. ii, xlv (xlv), cix (cx)).

(2) The second was of the humble, peaceful, healing Saviour, who would bind up the wounds of his people and preach peace to them that were far off and them that were nigh—of a figure who was the projection of the sobered hopes of a people returned from captivity in Babylon. For the prototype of this figure one must go behind David to Moses (cf. Zac. ix, 9; Isa. xlii, 1-4).

(3) According to a third expectation the human Messiah was replaced by God himself, who would come in person to save his people. This too was a post-exilic development of the messianic hope (cf. Isa. xl, 1-11; xliii-xlv; Mal. iii).

(4) Finally in a fourth development the personal human Messiah is replaced by the corporate 'Messiah-nation', which is endowed with the attributes of the warlike, triumphant Christ of the first messianic picture. This development is represented by the prophecy of Daniel (cf. vii, 13, 27), and was stimulated by the national resurgence under the Maccabees in the middle of the second century B.C.

St Luke shows, in effect, that Jesus fulfils all four kinds of messianic expectation, in spite of their apparent incompatibilities, and that he is the glorious Messiah, the humble Messiah, the divine Saviour, and the embodiment of the messianic nation. We can do no more here than consider four episodes in the gospel—which will not, of course, correspond neatly to the four kinds of expecta-



tion we have outlined, but which will have some bearing on all of them.

*The baptism, genealogy and temptation* (Luke iii, 21-iv, 13).

The voice from heaven that bore testimony to Jesus (iii, 22) utters a composite quotation of Psalm ii, 7 and Isaias xlii, 1, 'Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased'; the text is almost identical with the parallel passages in Matthew iii, 17 and Mark i, 11. But there is another reading, anciently attested, in which the voice simply quotes Psalm ii; 'Thou art my Son, I this day have begotten thee'. There are sound reasons for thinking that this was the original text, and that it got assimilated by later copyists to the other two gospels. If this is so, then the heavenly voice is designating Jesus as the triumphant warrior Christ of the Davidic psalm. If the composite reading is preferred, then he is being designated as both the glorious and the humble Christ.

It is from the second psalm, and such similar passages as Psalm cix (cx), that the Christ-title of 'Son of God' is derived. This title in the gospels, it must be clearly stated, does *not* directly signify the divine nature of our Lord. It was precisely a messianic title, it belonged to the Davidic kings of Israel as the anointed of the Lord. One might regard Psalms ii and cix (cx) as coronation psalms, in which the conferring of the kingdom on a man, to be God's representative, is thought of metaphorically as a divine begetting or birth.

The descent of the Spirit upon Jesus has a similar significance. It recalls the prophecy of Isaias xi, 1ff.: 'And there shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him . . .'. It is precisely in virtue of the Spirit resting upon him that Jesus is the Christ, the anointed of God, anointed by the Spirit of God. But the Spirit came down in the form of a dove, and this should take our minds further than David and the house of Jesse, back to the story of the flood, and the dove that came back to the ark carrying a spray of olive. Thus Jesus is shown to be more than the anointed representative of God to his chosen people, more than the old kings of Israel; he is the anointed harbinger of peace and reconciliation to all mankind. In his person the Spirit is restored to man, which man's wickedness had forfeited in the days of old (cf. Gen. vi, 3). St Luke then proceeds to reinforce these suggestive

symbols of the baptism scene by taking the genealogy of Jesus back beyond Abraham, where Matthew started it, to Adam. Jesus is the son of David, he is the son of Adam (the second Adam, as St Paul will say), and the son of God. No merely national Messias of the Jewish people, he is the cosmic, universal, Christ, and as such he immediately goes out to do battle with the ancient enemy of mankind.

Thus the baptism, genealogy, and temptation, show Jesus to be the glorious, warrior, Christ of the first strand of messianic expectation—and much more. This is a feature we will notice again; Jesus not only fulfils, he *transcends* Israel's messianic hopes.

*The visit to Nazareth* (Luke iv, 17-30)

In this passage our Lord applies to himself the opening verses of Isaias lxi, a chapter in which the prophet describes a time of messianic blessings, which are however bestowed by a humble, not a glorious Messias. The blessings admittedly include, in verse 2, 'the day of vengeance of our God', presumably on the gentile oppressors (cf. v. 5), but the quotation in St Luke significantly omits the phrase, and our Lord, after reading the passage, counteracts any exaggerated ideas his hearers may have been inclined to have on this score by his remarks on the widow of Sarepta and Naaman the Syrian. The reaction of his fellow citizens indicates just what exaggerated ideas they were inclined to have.

The figure with whom Jesus identifies himself is clearly the Messias, because he speaks in the prophecy about God having anointed him, and says what this anointing consists of, namely the outpouring on him of the Spirit. The way in which anointing with oil was regarded as symbolic of the gift of the Spirit is shown by the stories about the anointing of Saul and David (I Kings (Sam.) x, 1-6; xvi, 1-13).

But this anointed figure of Isaias has none of the splendour of a king. His function is not to rule or conquer, but to bring a message ('to preach the gospel', v. 17), and to make a proclamation ('to preach', v. 19); that is to say he is a *messenger* and a *herald*. These were the functions of the old testament prophets, which is why Jesus goes on to refer to himself as a prophet. Finally the figure in Isaias declares that he has been *sent*. Now for a person



to be *sent* as a *messenger* and a *herald* means that he is some sort of a subordinate to the one who sent him, he is a servant. That 'He who has been sent' or 'The Sent-One' (it is one word in the Greek) was regarded as a messianic title is at least suggested by John ix, 7; but it was a title clearly more suited to the humble than to the glorious Christ. It is a perfect contrast to the glorious Christ title 'He who is to come' or 'The Coming-One', of which we will see more shortly. For an interesting light on the different emphases of the different gospel narratives, we may compare Luke iv, 43, 'To other cities also I must preach the kingdom of God, for that is why *I was sent*', with the parallel text in Mark i, 38, 'Let us go into the neighbouring towns and cities that I may preach there also; for this purpose *am I come*'.

Thus Jesus is here claiming for himself the function of humble Messiah. But these messianic titles, *Sent*, *Messenger*, *Herald*, which are derived from this passage of Isaiah and other similar ones, have further implications. For they are among the functions or roles which our Lord conferred upon his disciples; the very name 'apostle' means 'one who has been sent', and it was as *heralds* (preachers) with a *message* (the gospel) that our Lord sent his apostles. In other words they (and the Church founded on them) would share in his messianic function. The solidarity of his followers with him in his messianic functions is shown in such a passage, to take only one, as Luke x, 16, 'He that listens to you listens to me, and he that despises you despises me; while he that despises me despises him that sent me'.

So far we have seen divine testimony born to the character of Jesus as the glorious Christ, and his own claim to be the humble Christ. But both the testimony and the claim need substantiation. It is in the subsequent chapters of the gospel, describing the deeds of Jesus, that the substantiation is given. It would take too long to give chapter and verse for the assertion, which I consider is a true one, that *all* our Lord's miracles were messianic signs which fell into categories established by the prophets. But the important point is that the miracles of his Galilean ministry, the healings and the feedings of the multitudes and the casting out of devils (to be regarded perhaps as 'release for the captives', Isa. lxi, 1), were all signs appropriate to the humble Messiah. This consideration brings us to our crucial third passage.

*John's question to Jesus* (Luke vii, 18-28)

John the Baptist was conscious of his own mission as the fore-runner of the Christ; he had seen and heard the testimony of heaven borne to Jesus as the glorious Christ; and when he was in prison he heard, as St Matthew puts it in his account of the episode, of 'the works of the Christ' (xi, 2). But the problem for him was that these works were the works of the humble Christ, of the humble 'Sent-One', not of the triumphant 'Coming-One' whom, as he thought, he had baptized in the Jordan. He himself had been *sent* as a *herald* and *messenger*. Was he then only the herald of a herald? Would there be a second and glorious Christ to follow Jesus? One strand of Jewish rabbinic tradition did work out a sort of theory of two Messiahs, in order to resolve precisely the sort of dilemma, created by the prophecies, that must have been troubling John. And so he sends to ask 'Art thou the Coming-One, or are we to expect another?'. This title of the Coming-One is derived principally from Psalm cxvii (cxviii), 26, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord', a text recited daily at the Sanctus in the mass. It occurs again in the Apocalypse as a divine title 'He who is and who was and who is to come'. And we look forward to our Lord's second *coming*, which in one sense will not be his second but his first coming, because his first appearance at the incarnation was a *mission*, a being sent rather than a coming in this very special messianic sense. The dilemma which puzzled John, and which some of the Jewish rabbis evaded by postulating two Christs, two Messiahs, Christian doctrine has resolved in terms of the second coming, that is of two manifestations of one and the same Christ.

Jesus, naturally enough, did not expound this in so many words in his answer to John. But he clearly could not accept the dilemma which John's question assumed, because he was the glorious Christ, and yet he must continue to play the role of the humble Christ, because it was in virtue of that role that 'the Christ had to suffer'. Furthermore, he was already, but in a hidden way, performing one essential task of the Coming-One, namely inaugurating the age to come.

So he answered in what we could almost regard as a prophetic cipher. By the allusions of his answer he refers John to Isaiah lxi, 1, which is, as we have seen, a humble Messiah passage. But his answer also contains an allusion to Isaiah xxxv, 5, which runs:



'Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened and the ears of the deaf unstopped; then shall the lame man leap like a deer, and the tongue of the dumb sing for joy'. This picture of blessings is no different to that which is proper to the work of the humble Messiah; but we get the point of this apparently rather flat allusion, if we look at the preceding verse, Isaiah xxxv, 4, to which the 'then' of v. 5 refers: 'Say to those who are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not. Behold, your God *will come* with vengeance, with the recompense of God; *he will come* and save you'. Thus our Lord's answer could be deciphered as 'Yes, I am he who is to come; I am he who is to come with a vengeance'. It is a cryptic claim to be more than the glorious Christ, to be in fact the divine Saviour of the third strand of messianic expectation. If we hear in his last words to John's messengers, 'and blessed is he that is not scandalized at me', an echo of Isaiah viii, 13-14, the lesson is reinforced. So also is it by his quotation from Malachias iii, 1, with which he concludes his short discourse to the crowd about John the Baptist.

*Peter's confession and the transfiguration* (Luke ix, 18-36)

Peter's confession is the climax of what we might call the first act of the gospel drama, of which the chief instructive purpose is to establish that 'Jesus is the Christ'. Our consideration of John's dilemma should show how difficult it necessarily was for our Lord to establish this all-important ground work of the gospel, in spite of his manifestly messianic miracles. And even though Peter's confession had been preceded a short while before by such a stupendous messianic sign as the feeding of the five thousand, his confession of Jesus as the Christ remains a great act of faith, and can not be regarded as drawing an easy conclusion from evidence that sticks out a mile. For the evidence all pointed to Jesus as the humble Christ, and Peter acknowledged him, in words which echo Psalm ii (much more so in Matthew than in Luke), as the glorious Christ. He had triumphed, thanks to the Father's revelation (Matt. xvi, 17), over the very genuine and natural doubts which John's question expressed.

And so it is that immediately after Peter's confession our Lord goes on to the even more difficult second stage of instruction, and begins to teach them that 'the Son of man must suffer many things . . .' (Luke ix, 22). This is our first encounter with the title

'Son of man'. The context of its use shortly after in v. 26, which talks about the Son of man coming in the glory of his Father and of the holy angels, shows its dependence on Daniel's 'Son of man' (Dan. vii). This figure is a personification of the messianic race; our Lord, in using it, lays claim to being the embodiment of the messianic people. He is in person 'the Israel of God', in person the remnant of the old Israel of which the prophets, Isaias in particular, had so much to say, in person the head, or beginning, of the new Israel the Church, of which St Paul will have so much to say. The title 'Son of man' has many ramifications; it is a name that takes Jesus, so to say, outside the limitations of Israel, and links him with mankind at large; it is an Adamic name, St Paul as good as translated it into 'the second Adam.' It lies at the root of his doctrine of the Church as the body of Christ.

If we call Peter's confession of Jesus as the Christ the climax of the first act of the gospel, we could regard the transfiguration as the closing tableau to that act. It recapitulates all the lessons, or rather all the patterns, which have been gradually unfolded during our Lord's ministry in Galilee. We can only glance in a very summary manner at the significance of some of the details in a picture of extraordinary symbolic richness.

First Jesus is manifested as the one to whom the Law and the Prophets (Moses and Elias) bore witness. And in particular we are reminded of the manifestations of God to each of these figures on Mt Sinai or Horeb (Exod. xxiv, 9; xxxiii, 18; III(I) Kings xix, 9). But we notice that this is not a manifestation of God to Jesus, as those theophanies had been manifestations of God to Moses and Elias; he is rather in the same relation to them and the apostles as the Lord God had been to them individually. This is a theophany, a manifestation of God, not *to* Jesus but *in* Jesus. It is really the three apostles, rather than Jesus, who like the two prophets of old have the experience. The cloud comes and overshadows them, as it had covered Moses; the voice speaks to them, as it had spoken to Elias. Peter talks to Jesus as Moses and Elias had talked to God. The apostles awoke and 'saw his glory'. In other words they see him not only as the glorious royal Christ to whom Moses and the prophets bear witness, but as the divine Christ and king of Israel, whom Moses and the prophets served.

But Moses and Elias are talking to him about his 'decease' which he is to accomplish in Jerusalem. The word St Luke actually uses is



'exodus'. Our Lord is going to accomplish another exodus by his death; indeed his death and resurrection are going to *be* another exodus of a new people of God, summed up and epitomized in Christ their head.

The cloud and the voice really repeat, in slightly different 'picture language', the theme of the baptism scene. The cloud is an alternative symbol for the overshadowing Spirit of God. The voice this time alludes no more to the triumphant Psalm ii, but by the epithet 'my *chosen* Son', or, as in the alternative reading, 'my *beloved* Son', it echoes such a passage as Isaias xli, 8—'but thou, Israel, my servant Jacob whom I *chose*, seed of Abraham whom I *loved*'—or Isaias xlii, 1—'Jacob my servant, I will uphold; Israel my *chosen*, my soul delighted in him'. (I have quoted these passages according to the Greek translation, which would underlie the gospel allusions.) Thus Jesus is once again being designated as the humble Messiah, characteristic of the prophecies of the second half of Isaias, but this time by reference to passages—commonly called the 'Servant passages'—which stress almost the identification of this figure of God's servant with his people. He is the embodiment of the Christ-nation, but this is now the *suffering* Christ-nation, not the triumphant Christ-nation of Daniel's Son of man.

Jesus is the Christ. This is the primordial article of the Christian faith, the seed from which the Christian religion and Church grew, and it is a seed that was germinated in the old testament. This is the original point of division between Christianity and Judaism. And yet in current usage we often use the name 'Christ' as if it were, so to say, no more than our Lord's surname—something like Smith or Baker. At least we should try and make ourselves aware of the tremendous and mysterious significance of this surname, which is indeed the necessary clue to a proper understanding of the gospels, and the whole new testament.

## THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN CONTEMPORARY JEWISH THOUGHT<sup>1</sup>

A. I. POLACK

ON the eve of the Sabbath and Festivals a hymn is regularly sung in all Synagogues and Jewish homes called 'Yigdal' (Magnificat). It contains in poetic form thirteen principles of the Jewish faith, originally formulated in the twelfth century by Maimonides, the great Jewish philosopher who had such a profound influence on his contemporaries (such as Thomas Aquinas), and among them there is a verse which runs, 'He will send our Anointed (Messiah) at the end of days to redeem them that wait for the end—his salvation'.

That is one of many allusions to the coming of the Messiah in the Hebrew Prayer-book in general use today. Some of them actually mention his descent, as the phrase in the Festival Amidah: 'May our remembrance rise and come and be accepted before thee . . . together with the remembrance of Messiah, the son of David'. Sometimes a synonym is used, as in the opening paragraph of the Amidah: 'Blessed be thou O Lord our God Who wilt bring a redeemer (Goel) to their children's children (i.e. of the patriarchs) for thy name's sake', or in the prayer for the Royal Family in England which ends—'and may the redeemer come unto Zion'. More often still (as in the Alenu prayer) the worshipper petitions God to hasten on the age of redemption for Israel and for mankind, when 'God's kingdom shall be established on earth and all the children of flesh will call upon thy name'.

When we examine the liturgy of any modern religious community two questions of fundamental importance immediately arise: (1) whence did the ideas and beliefs it embodies originate? and (2) how far are these ideas—and this is particularly important with regard to a very ancient liturgy like the Jewish—held today by those who belong to the religion concerned? For we know that the sanctity and authority attached to forms of worship are such that they are not easily changed even when the ideas they express no longer appeal to, or have the same meaning for,

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the Spode House Conference of Catholics and Jews, June 1960.



the majority of worshippers. (It is interesting in this context to note the elimination of the phrase 'perfidios Judaeos' from the Good Friday liturgy through the action of the present Pope, a change for which Jews throughout the world are profoundly grateful.) The Jewish liturgy dates from the Gaonic period (sixth century) but, though some prayers are much more recent, others go back to biblical times and the Second Temple. When, therefore, we consider what part the messianic idea plays in contemporary Jewish thought, we shall have to examine what this concept first meant to its creators, and then what it means to the various sections of the Jewish people today.

A study of the origins of Messianism shows that it was a blend of several types of aspiration and belief about the future, and this means both the future of Israel and of mankind as a whole. It was first formulated in the minds of the Hebrew prophets, later carried on in the thought of apocalyptic writers of what is sometimes called the Daniel literature, and finally given form and substance in the Rabbinic period. The Hebrew root from which the word Messiah is derived means 'to anoint'. Its later and religious connotation came from the practice of anointing with oil anyone (e.g. a king or priest) who was to be sanctified or specially marked out for the service of God. Even a heathen prince, Cyrus, is called 'my Messiah' by a Hebrew prophet of the captivity, for his task was to deliver God's people out of the hand of their oppressors. Gradually, however, the term came to be associated with the idea of a prince of Davidic descent who should establish Israel at the head of the nations and inaugurate an epoch when 'the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established at the top of the mountains and all nations shall flow unto it'. This conception coupled the spiritual supremacy of the Jewish people with an age of peace and prosperity for all men.

A second, rather different, figure emerges from certain chapters of the Second Isaiah. Here for the first time we find suffering beginning to be interpreted in terms of its vicarious purpose. In the so-called servant songs, the messianic figure, possibly as an individual, but more likely the elect people of God, symbolically personified, has to play the humiliating role of scapegoat. They were to be despised and rejected by the nations, the chastisement of whose sins was to be upon them. But in the end their suffering would prove to be their glory and many transgressors would be

turned to righteousness by it. The impact of this teaching upon the whole life and ministry of Jesus cannot be too strongly emphasized. And it must be remembered in this context that the belief of the early Christian Church was not a ground of division between them and other Jews.

Thirdly, while it would appear that the figure visualized in the messianic passages of the prophets is that of a human ruler, there emerged during the Hasmonean period another quite different figure of apocalyptic literature, the 'Son of Man'. There is some doubt about the meaning of the title. In Ezekiel it is used simply to signify a frail child of man, or Adam; in the later apocalyptic books (e.g. Daniel and Enoch) the Son of Man is a supernatural figure who appears in the clouds and receives dominion over all people in perpetuity. We may say that the Messiah came to be thought of as the ruler of the new kingdom in so far as it was to be brought about in history, while the Son of Man would be enthroned by the direct intervention of God. The latter conception was therefore more free from any particular aspirations on the part of the Jewish people. It is most completely expressed in a book of the first century B.C., *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

Then shall the Lord raise up a new priest,  
And to him all the words of the Lord shall be revealed;  
And his star shall arise in Heaven as of a King,  
Lighting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day . . .  
And there shall none succeed him for all generations for ever,  
And in his priesthood the gentiles shall be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth,  
And enlightened through the grace of the Lord.

(*Testament of Levi*. XVIII. 2-9.)

This concept, though it had a profound influence on Christian theology, was in the main rejected by the Rabbis. This is made clear by Dr Epstein in his recent 'Pelican' book in the chapter dealing with Rabbinic Judaism, and it may be said that Rabbinic Judaism is in general the Judaism of today. Here is what he wrote:

The kingdom of God in the scheme of Judaism will be ushered in by the Messiah. The Messiah will be the central dominating figure of an age which will witness the reign of righteousness on earth, a righteousness which will bring universal peace and plenty, plenty of the things necessary for a religious life, with-



out taking away the need for sacrifice on behalf of ever-widening and growing ideals. But the Messiah in Jewish teaching is not a supernatural being, nor a divine being, having a share in the forgiveness of sin; much less is he to be confused with God. At the highest the Messiah is but a mortal leader who will be instrumental in fully rehabilitating Israel in its ancient homeland, and through a restored Israel bring about the moral and spiritual regeneration of the whole of humanity, making all mankind fit citizens of the kingdom.

Before leaving the background picture with reference to Messianism and showing the effect it has on the Jewish outlook of today, a word should perhaps be said about the disillusion which has been experienced by the Jewish people in regard to this boldly imaginative but perhaps too facile and optimistic concept at different stages in their history. Jewish history, it is sometimes said, teems with false Messiahs—that is the appearance of persons in many countries (a Rabbinic passage says the Messiah will appear in Rome) who claimed in each age to be the anointed messenger divinely ordained to redeem the people of Israel as a prelude to the advent of *Olam Haba*, the world to come or the Kingdom of God. Even before the beginning of the Christian era there was a group of men—we may call them the Apocalyptic Pharisees—who emphasized the supernatural element in the messianic belief, and looked for an immediate sign of deliverance from heaven. Josephus tells us that they were always urging the people to follow them into the desert, and he mentioned two 'false prophets', Theudas and a certain Egyptian, who were put to death by the Roman government after their promise to perform certain miracles had proved a delusion. Then there was the great rebel leader Bar Cochbar (Son of the Star) acclaimed even by Rabbi Akiba as a military Messiah, who led a formidable, and for a time successful, insurrection against Hadrian in 132, when he ordered a temple to be erected to Jupiter Capitolinus on the sacred site of the ancient Jewish Temple. It proved in the end a ghastly failure and led to the ruthless Hadrianic persecutions. Finally there is the romantic career of Sabbatai Zevi. He was born in Smyrna in 1626 and his father was an agent of an English firm. Hence he came aware of the fifth monarchy dreams of the English Puritans and was also profoundly influenced by Jewish mystical or Cabbalistic writings, e.g. the *Zohar*, which incidentally led to

the return of the Jewish community to England just over three hundred years ago. Sabbatai became convinced that he was no other than the long-awaited Messiah and such was the uniqueness and fascination of his personality that he was acclaimed by almost the whole Jewish world. The story of his meteoric rise, his marriage to a Polish convert to Catholicism, his subsequent downfall and final embracing of the Moslem faith is too well known to be repeated here. But, though a small sect continued allegiance to him after his death and a number of pseudo-Messiahs followed him, his fraudulent career proved a final disillusionment to the vast majority of the Jewish people, and no figure of comparable stature has been acclaimed as Messiah since his day.

In what ways have these early religious teachings about the coming of the Lord's anointed messenger and their subsequent strange, almost bizarre, expression in Jewish history, affected Jewish thought today? To answer that question we will have to make some examination of Jewish contemporary life and consider the various ideological groups into which the community is divided. But there are two basic views, one negative, the other positive, held in common by almost the whole of the Jewish community. First, the idea of the intervention of a supernatural agent to bring about the world's salvation, which belonged to the Apocalyptic school of thought has been virtually discarded. 'The Jewish Messiah', writes Joseph Klausner, 'is truly human in origin, of flesh and blood, like all mortals.'

Secondly, any narrow national militaristic ideas, which may have applied to the messianic concept, have entirely disappeared. The messianic hope is today concentrated on the future happiness, peace, and harmony of the whole of mankind, and this has been beautifully expressed in a passage from the late Chief Rabbi's *Book of Jewish Thoughts*:

When the harp of Judah sounded, thrilled with the touch of inspiration Divine, among the echoes it awaked in the human heart were those sweet sounds whose witcheries transport the soul into the realms of happiness. The melody has been our source of courage, our solace and our strength, and in all our wanderings we have sung it. It is the music of the messianic age, the triumph hymn to be one day thundered by all humanity, the real psalm of life, as mankind shall sing it when Israel's world-task of teaching it shall have been accom-



plished. Its harmony is the harmony of the families of the earth at last at peace, at last united in brotherhood, at last happy in their return to the One Great Father. (H. Kareira Mendes, 1887.)

So much for the general messianic vision shared by the whole Jewish community today. But now we have to consider three variations on this central theme, three ways in which there is or may be, some division of opinion or different shades of emphasis between the various sections of the community. They relate to: (1) the concept of the Messiah as a person; (2) the transforming of this to a belief in the coming of the messianic age; (3) the role played in this context by the Holy Land and in particular the present State of Israel.

Broadly speaking, the Rabbinic school of thought, which represents orthodoxy, the fundamentalism of the oral Law, still adheres to a belief in the coming of a personal Messiah. This, as has been said, is explicit in the language of the orthodox prayer-book as well as in such customs as the placing of an extra cup of wine on the Passover Night table ready for Elijah the prophet, 'the harbinger of the Messiah'. But even a section of the orthodox have given up the idea of a personal messenger of God, and substituted a belief in the advent of the messianic age, with its particular challenge to the people of Israel. This applies, too, to the whole Reformist and Liberal movement. Here let me quote some words from a recent book by a Liberal Jewish minister, the Rev. John Rayner, called *Towards Mutual Understanding*. He has been discussing the Christian belief in Jesus as the Messiah, and he writes: 'From the point of view of Liberal Judaism the question whether Jesus was the Messiah does not really arise. For it does not believe in a personal Messiah at all, but only in a messianic age. It does not believe that redemption will come through the agency of one individual, but through the collective progress of mankind under the guidance of God.' It should be added that there is complete agreement between them and the Orthodox that the test of the messianic age must be the establishment of universal justice, brotherhood and peace, and that this is still a consummation devoutly to be wished and to be striven for.

Finally there is the complication introduced by modern Zionism. How far is this a messianic, how far a purely political, movement based on national revival and social expediency?

The answer is that both elements have played and are playing a part in the building up of the State of Israel and perhaps to some extent are interlocked. They may be found respectively in the writings of Achad Haam and the policy and career of Theodore Herzl. 'In a word', as Sir Leon Simon writes in *The Jewish Heritage*, 'the apocalyptic and the strictly common-sense elements in the age-long hope of the exiled Jewish people for a return to its own land are so inextricably bound up together that any attempt to isolate the one group of motives from the other is artificial. The messianic hope cannot properly be described as either religious or political so long as these two terms are regarded as antithetic.'

This is expressed with great conviction and sincerity. I must, however, add my own deep misgiving about the claim that the modern State of Israel, whatever the hopes of its founders, has in practice any right (more for instance than this country) to be considered as messianically informed. It may readily be conceded that the building of the new State has been a triumph of courage, idealism and hard work. It has given new hope to great numbers of human beings who had lost everything, it has brought the maimed and the sick back to health, it has in places turned the desert into a highway. But there is a terrible, obverse side to the picture. The creation of the new state has not proved an unmixed blessing. To many concerned it has brought nothing but misery and despair. It has been the indirect means of uprooting hundreds of comparatively innocent people from their homes and causing them to live in penury and squalor. It has offended the religious susceptibilities of both traditionalists and progressives by much of its legislation. It has unsettled and in many cases obliterated the Jewish communities in a number of countries, where they represented an advanced section of the population. It has caused a state of tension among surrounding countries which oscillates between a cold and a fighting war.

We cannot on this evidence, whatever the provocations which Israelis face, accord the title Messianic to such a State. It is (I suppose that this is inevitable in the modern world) a secular State like other states, whose policy is based on expediency, self-interest and the will to survive. Had it been a messianic State the first thing it would do would be to bring back the Arab refugees to their homes. It could never for a moment acquiesce in the

deplorable conditions which prevail in the refugee camps. 'Is this the fast that I have chosen? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house?' (Is. iv, 3). Nor would it root out through its secret service and entirely illegal methods, a persecutor of its people from a peaceful country in South America, in order that it may enact the punishment he undoubtedly deserves. Here there is an issue on which the views of different sections of Jews seem at the moment to be irreconcilable.

I say for the moment, for fundamentally they are at one in their deeper aspirations for the messianic age and in regarding themselves as a messianic people. And it is on this note of agreement that I should like to close. The deepest and most cherished conviction of the Jewish people is that they have been consecrated, ever since the Sinaitic revelation and through their long, unique history of suffering and service, to keep undimmed before men's eyes the sublime messianic vision of a united humanity. They are specially qualified for this role by their dispersal among the peoples of the world. 'And the remnant of Jacob shall be among many nations as dew from the Lord, as showers upon the grass' (Micah. v). Theirs is a fertilizing and regenerative task, one they now share with many Christians and other religious groups. For the Hebraic idea of the messianic age is not just a piece of escapism, a rhetorical flight, an idle dream about an unreal world remote from our own. It is realizable in the world of time and space as we know it. It can be brought nearer and ever nearer by men's effort, working in harmony with the will of God. As Claude Tresmontant has so penetratingly stated in his recent book, *A Study in Hebrew Thought*, 'God created creative beings. History is a work in which divine action and the action of men co-operate. *Theou gar esmen sunergoi*—"We are co-workers with God".'



A NOTE ON 'THE JEWS' OF ST JOHN'S GOSPEL<sup>1</sup>

JORDAN VINK, O.P.

RECENT studies (cf. in particular *The Destination and Purpose of St John's Gospel*, by J. A. T. Robinson, in *New Testament Studies*, 6, 1960, 117-113) have radically questioned certain common assumptions about the fourth gospel. It is too often taken for granted that the evangelist is addressing his message to gentile Christians, and that he considers the Jewish nation—the *Judaei*—as lost to God, and as rejected by him because they have rejected Christ. But it is surely significant that in his gospel, alone among the books of the new testament, the word 'gentiles' never occurs. The dramatic narrative centres almost exclusively on what the author regards as the crisis of Judaism.

Let us start with the two texts, xii, 20—'Now there were certain *Hellenes* (Greeks) among those coming up to worship at the feast'—and vii, 35—'The *Judaei* (Jews) therefore said to one another, Where is he going to go to, that we shall not find him? Is he going to go to the Dispersion of the *Hellenes* (Greeks), and to teach the *Hellenes*?' Commentators have always felt that the most satisfactory meaning of the *Hellenes* in both texts is the Jews of the *diaspora*, Jews, that is, living in the Greek-speaking world (and speaking Greek themselves) outside Palestine. St Paul, from Tarsus, would have been such a Hellene. But if this is so, it is a usage that is peculiar to this book of the new testament. In Acts vi, 1 and ix, 29 these Jews of the *diaspora* are called *Hellenists*, and in Acts xxi, 27, as generally in St Paul's epistles, 'Hellenes' undoubtedly means gentile Greeks.

If then we stick to the view that in the passages quoted from St John 'Hellenes' means Greek-speaking Jews, it would seem to follow that it is a usage proper and peculiar to a Palestinian context, one indeed that in the wider context of the new testament as a whole is liable to be misunderstood. Now perhaps this narrow Palestinian context of the fourth gospel, deduced from its peculiar use of the word *Hellenes*, might also affect the meaning in this gospel of the word *Judaei*. In iii, 22 reference is made to 'the

<sup>1</sup> From a paper read at the Spode House Conference of Catholics and Jews, June 1960.

Judaeen land' a rather cumbersome way of saying Judaea—and a few words later to a *Judaeus*, which it would seem, in the context is better translated 'Judaeen' than 'Jew'. The same is true of vii, 1, where 'he would not walk in Judaea, because the *Judaeans* were seeking to kill him' seems to be the obvious meaning. Now it is of course only in the narrow context of Palestine that the word *Judaei* could be used to designate the inhabitants of Judaea as distinct from other Jews; but in that context such a usage is perfectly natural—indeed there was no other usage available.

It would seem, then, that relations between Jews and gentiles at large simply did not come within the author's purview—that he lacked the very terminology with which to deal with it. So the question asked in vii, 35 is an instance of Johannine irony. The reader to whom the gospel is directed—who is precisely a Hellene, that is a Greek-speaking (Christian) Jew—knows that Jesus certainly is going to go to the dispersion and teach the Hellenes; that he is doing so by means of this very gospel. The purpose of the gospel would then be, according to this line of thought, to prevent the tragedy of rejection that had happened in Judaea and alienated the *Judaei* from Christ, being repeated among the Jews of the *diaspora*. It speaks of the work of Jesus as being 'to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad' (xi, 52), which again is an expression that only takes on full meaning in a Judaic, Palestinian context. Jesus is the fulfilment of Jewish religion rightly understood, not antagonistic to it (vid. e.g. iv, 21-3).

Might not this thesis, developed by Robinson in the work cited and by van Unnik in a paper read to the Congress on the Gospels at Oxford in 1957, account satisfactorily for the inescapable impression we receive from the fourth gospel that in it 'we are reading the most Hebraic book in the new testament, except perhaps the Apocalypse'? (Lightfoot.)

The thesis does indeed have to face substantial difficulties; thus there are several references to 'the feast of the *Judaei*' (ii, 13; v, 1; vi, 4); customs of the *Judaei* are explained (ii, 6; xix, 40); the term 'Messias' is translated (iv, 25), as also the name 'Siloe' (ix, 7). This would seem to suggest that the writer is addressing a non-Jewish, gentile audience. But Robinson answers that in every case but one (vi, 4) the phrase 'feast of the *Judaei*' explains why Jesus has to go up to *Judaea*, from Galilee; that explanations of the

language and customs of Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Jews are not superfluous for the Greek-speaking Jews of the *diaspora*; for example the use of water-pots for purification ceremonies (ii, 6) was a distinctively Palestinian custom; and that many of these details had to be mentioned to point the sign and its interpretation which the evangelist was concerned to put across. As for xix, 40, one might add to Robinson's considerations the point that the burial customs there described must have seemed specifically Judæan at least to the Qumrân community, for they appear to have buried their dead without any garment at all.

In our personal view these studies should have considerable repercussions in the whole field of literary criticism of the fourth gospel, which in the light of them needs careful but serious reconsideration. However this may be, and it is for scholars to make their own considered judgments, it is clear that these ideas have an immediate bearing on the Jewish-Christian dialogue. Expressions from the fourth gospel, taken uncritically at their face value as being harshly 'anti-Jewish', have often proved to be a serious difficulty in discussions between Christians and Jews. But in the light of the evidence we have outlined, many 'theological' statements about the rejection of the Jews by God, based on Johannine texts, appear to say the least to be rather facile. The genuine attitude of the evangelist seems to be much more humane, and much more appropriate to Christians today; one of urgent appeal to Israel to find in Jesus a higher level of its own life, the fulfilment in fact of its true vocation.



## THE HOLY NAME

A.K.R.

*'See, the name of the Lord is coming from afar and its brightness fills the world.'*

**W**E begin the new liturgical year looking forward to the coming of one whose name is hidden from us, but gradually revealed in the course of Advent. This name 'comes from afar', it comes indeed from the heart of God, from the mind of the Father, because it is the name of his Word, his only-begotten and well-beloved Son. But as yet it is to us a deep



mystery. We are gazing at this profound mystery from a great distance, and because of the immense abyss which separates us from God, our sight is blurred. In our state of fallen human nature, our gaze is darkened because of original sin and our own personal sins and therefore we need the brightness, the shining clarity of this name to fill the whole earth. It must fill our minds because the truth of God is for us so obscure. It must enlighten and inflame our wills because it is by love that we are united to God in this life. So we begin again with the Church to pierce the darkness of the mystery of God and to await the complete revelation of his own most wonderful, ineffable name. 'I will wait for thy name, O Lord, for it is good in the sight of thy saints' (Office of the Holy Name. Resp. 8).

Our longing desires make us ask, what is this name? Who is the 'One who is to come, who is to rule the people of Israel'? (Office of Sun. I in Advent, Resp. 1). Looking into the vision of night, Daniel saw the Son of man, to whom is given all honour and power (*ibid.*, Resp. 2). We learn from this that we await a human person, and in the joy of this knowledge, we cry out: 'Hear the Word of the Lord, O gentiles, and tell it as good news, even to the ends of the earth: and in the islands which are close to us say: our Saviour shall come' (*ibid.*, Resp. 6). This 'one who is to be sent' is 'to reign as king and will be wise' and 'this is the name he will be called, the Lord, the Just One' (*ibid.*, Resp. 9). Isaias reveals that 'a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son and his name shall be called Wonderful, God, the Strong One' (*ibid.*, Resp. 7). The climax of the revelation made at the beginning of Advent is the message of Gabriel to our Lady, fulfilling the prophecies which have been recalled to our minds, by announcing the coming of a son who will be called Son of the Most High (*ibid.*, Resp. 3 and 4).

Following the liturgy in the breviary during Advent, we can trace this hidden name through the weeks that precede Christmas. Sometimes we seem to have reached our goal, and to have discovered the one who is to come. Yet we find each time that he escapes us. It is the secret of the soul's approach to God. At times we seem so near, as if only a thread must be snapped before we are already in him and utterly consumed in his power and love. Then as we seem to draw near to the holy of holies, and to be even now possessed by God himself, this very holiness, this utterly trans-

cent purity would seem to cast us off again into darkness. As once we felt so near, we appear now to be surrounded by a darkness more penetrating and obscure than ever before. We need to ponder and make our own all the assurances of the prophets that the 'Holy One of Israel is our protector' (Sun. II, Resp. 4). We are told not to grieve but rather to rejoice because of the depths of loving kindness in the heart of our Lord (*ibid.*, Resp. 1, 3, 5, and 6). This mighty king who is coming in great power, who will teach us his ways and show us his mercy, is himself an expression of the tenderness, purity and strength of God, for he is called the Lamb.

As the weeks go by, new traits are revealed, while the themes of power, light, holiness and mercy coming into the world by the advent of the Saviour are enforced. His eternity is expressed, on the third Sunday, by the words: 'Thou, Bethlehem, city of the Most High God, out of thee shall come forth the ruler of Israel, and his going forth shall be as from the beginning from the days of eternity, and he shall be glorified in the midst of the earth and peace shall be in our land' (Sun. III, Resp. 3). More easily grasped by our sense-bound nature, we read of his beauty: 'His eyes are more beautiful than wine and his teeth more white than milk' (Sun. IV, Resp. 2). His name will be glorious (Sun. III, Resp. 9), he will be 'a priest after the order of Melchisedech', he will be called 'Emmanuel' (Ember Friday in Advent, Resp. 1 and 2).

It is on the last Sunday of Advent that we are finally invited to 'gaze right into the greatness of this one', so close at hand now, 'who is coming forth to save the nations. For this man is the king of justice whose generation hath no end' (Sun. IV, Resp. 8). The Church no longer conceals the infinite love of God the Father, who cares so much for the world that he sends his only-begotten Son, born of a virgin (*ibid.*, Resp. 4).

At last, on Christmas night, God speaks. He declares his name, which is his Word: 'Therefore my people shall know my name in that day; for I myself that spoke, behold I am here' (Isa. lii, Christmas, lesson 2). We sing in triumph: 'A child is born to us and a son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of peace' (Isa. ix, lesson 1). We know now, because we see the Word made

flesh, that the mysteriously hidden and beautiful name is the name of Jesus. 'A virgin has brought forth a king whose name is eternal' (Christmas Lauds, ant. 2) and it is with this holy name that the new year opens on the Feasts of the Circumcision and the Holy Name. It is as if, having been for so long concealed in the depths of the godhead, the presence of the Saviour who bears this beautiful name must be brought home to us by repeating this beloved name, this sweet name, Jesus. He it is whose brightness must fill the earth and every heart, being born again by grace in those who receive him. 'Stay with us, O Lord, and illumine us with thy light and when darkness of soul has been dispelled, fill the world with thy sweetness' (Office of the Holy Name, lauds hymn).



## CAMPION'S MISSION

CHARLES SOMERVILLE, S.J.

**W**HEN Edmund Campion after long temporizing finally broke from the allurements of his humanist's life at Oxford and retired abroad, Cecil observed of him: 'It is a very great pity to see so notable a man leave his country, for he was one of the diamonds of England'. Four years earlier, in 1566, when Queen Elizabeth visited Oxford, her chief minister had applauded the eloquence and personal charm of the rising Fellow of St John's college. On that occasion Campion had delivered orations in the name of the university before Elizabeth, as thirteen years earlier, representing London schoolboys, he had spoken his address to Queen Mary. Approbation, popularity and honour continued to follow him: he was made proctor and public orator, the highest posts compatible with his standing in the university. Then he tore the net which Anglicanism was throwing round him, withdrew to Ireland, was hunted thence because he lived as a Catholic and took refuge in Douai, 1571.



William Allen, founder of the English College at Douai, is justly called the second father of the Catholic Church in England, for he foiled the policy of William Cecil, Lord Burleigh, to deprive the English people of their priests and their ancient faith. To Allen, in turn, it must have been a disappointment, when after only eighteen months at Douai—long enough however for Campion to claim its proto-martyr, Cuthbert Mayne, a pupil—his prized professor left him to join the Jesuits in Rome. At that time the Society of Jesus had not taken any part in the English mission. But Allen was large-hearted: he made no demur; perhaps he looked forward to the reward he gained nine years later when he induced the Jesuit authorities to send priests to England, and Campion, ordained in 1578, was assigned with Robert Persons to that mission.

On the day that the company left Rome, April 18th 1580, one of secretary Walsingham's agents forwarded all their names to his master in London. Besides the Jesuits, with the lay-worker Ralph Emerson, he named four old Queen Mary priests, three young priests from the English College, Ralph Sherwin, Luke Kirby and Edward Rishton, two lay-men, Thomas Bruscoe and John Pascal, as well as the two leaders, who had gone ahead, Dr Gradwell, the eighty-year-old bishop of St Asaph, and Dr Morton, penitentiary of St Peter's.

On their arrival at Rheims after a six weeks' journey, the party learnt to their dismay of a very different expedition set afoot and sponsored by the pope. This was the sending to Ireland of Dr Sanders as papal legate with troops and money 'to comfort and assist the earl of Desmond and others who had taken up arms in defence of their religion'. Persons, reporting this painful surprise, continues: 'We plainly foresaw that this would be laid against us and other priests, if we should be taken in England (as though we had been privy or partakers thereof, as in very truth we were not, nor ever heard or suspected until this day). But as we could not remedy the matter and as our consciences were clear, we resolved through evil report or good report to go on with the purely spiritual action we had in hand.'

Sailing from different ports, in various disguises, by ones and twos, the missionaries reached England. Persons passed as a soldier returning from the Low Countries and prepared for Campion's later arrival in London. 'Mr Edmunds, a jewel

merchant', crossed to Dover, was detained on suspicion but was soon allowed to proceed. Arriving at the Thames Hythe he was recognized from Persons' description by one of George Gilbert's associates who stepped at once to the boat's side: 'Mr Edmunds, give me your hand; I stay here for you to lead you to your friends'. Off they went to a house in Chancery Lane, where Gilbert clothed the priest like a gentleman and furnished him with a horse. The house was that of the chief pursuivant.

Only the heroic co-operation of chivalrous lay-men made the mission of the priests possible. For expenses, for safe lodging, for guidance in travel, for introductions, George Gilbert's association of young Catholic gentry made itself responsible. Danger lurked everywhere. To consort with Campion soon became particularly dangerous. His so-called *Brag* or *Challenge*, while it aroused enthusiasm among Catholics, intensified the Government's search for its author. He wrote it in half an hour, at sudden call, when he and Persons were already saddled, about to leave London for the country. Mr Thomas Pounce, deputed by other Catholics, arrived to beg the Jesuits to set down the purpose of their mission on paper so that this might be produced in the event of their capture and imprisonment when 'the heretics might pretend, as is their custom, that they had recanted'. In a letter to his Father General, Campion summarizes these contents; 'I professed myself to be a priest of the Society, that I returned to enlarge the Catholic faith, to teach the gospel, to minister the sacraments, humbly asking audience of the queen and nobility of the realm and proffering disputes to the adversaries'. Pounce received the paper unsealed, later read it, was thrilled by its eloquence, and gave copies to some Catholics. Two copies soon fell into the hands of the council. In the letter mentioned above Campion writes: 'That error of spreading abroad hath much advanced the cause', but adds: 'At the very writing hereof, the persecution rages most cruelly. The house where I am is sad; no other talk but of death, prison or spoil of their friends; nevertheless they proceed with courage.'

During a single exciting year Campion ranged through the English counties, passing swiftly from one Catholic household to another; a stay of one night was usual; to stay longer courted danger. His first foray, lasting three months, took him into Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire. After it he wrote to

the Jesuit Father General: 'I ride about some piece of the country every day. The harvest is wonderful great. On horseback I meditate my sermon; when I come to the house I polish it. Then I talk with such as come to me or hear their confession. In the morning after mass I preach: they hear with exceeding greediness, and very often they receive the sacrament. . . . I cannot long escape the hands of the heretics; the enemies have so many eyes, so many tongues, so many scouts, so many crafts. I am in apparel to myself very ridiculous. I often change it and my name also.'

Proclamation after proclamation was issued by the government against harbouring the Jesuits. Spies and pursuivants sought the author of the *Brag*. Everywhere he went 'he heard it noised abroad that Campion was taken'. Nevertheless, in November, he made rendezvous at Uxbridge with Persons who despatched him further afield into Leicestershire, Derbyshire, Yorkshire and Lancashire. Burleigh's later investigations discovered many of the houses he stayed at—with dire consequences for his hosts. In Lancashire he was saved by a quick-witted servant maid: on a sudden appearance of pursuivants she pushed him into a muddy pond—an effectual disguise. Again people were greedy to hear his sermons. In snatched leisure he composed his *Decem Rationes* for the printing press which Persons had established, so that Catholics should not remain gagged, unable to reply to the publications of adversaries. Sent to Persons at Easter, 1581, checked in London for the accuracy of references, and seen through the press at Stonor Park by Campion himself, the work was printed and most of the four hundred copies were secretly distributed in the church of St Mary the Virgin, Oxford, for the commencement on June 27th.

*Ten Reasons for the confidence with which Edmund Campion offered his adversaries to dispute on behalf of the faith set before the famous men of our Universities* was the title. In his preface he says he had written, not published, a challenge to disputation; this had been taken 'atrociously', as if he had spoken from conceit. It had been answered, not with 'We accept your challenge; the Queen allows it; come', but with cries of 'Jesuit, sedition, arrogance, traitor'. He sees then that the only platform he will be allowed is the gallows: hence he gives the ten heads of his intended argument; a syllabus as it were of the lectures he was not allowed to deliver, to show that it was not his own strength, but the inherent strength of his cause, which gave him courage to



stand one against all. In a cause like this he may be killed, he cannot be conquered. After the exposition of his ten topics—the evidence of scripture, the Fathers, the councils, of Church history, etc.—he concludes with an appeal to Elizabeth to associate herself with her ancestors and the heroes of Christendom—all Catholics. ‘The day shall come, Elizabeth, that will show thee clearly who loved thee best, the Society of Jesus or the brood of Luther.’

The eloquent style, the confident arguments, the dramatic method of dispersal, the fame of the author, the outwitting of the government by the secret printing, all combined to make friends exultant and enemies angry. The latter gained speedy satisfaction. Within three weeks the author was taken at Lyford Grange in Berkshire. On Saturday, July 22nd 1581, he was led with derision through London (a paper stuck in his hat reading ‘Campion, the Seditious Jesuit’), and lodged in the Tower.

Now, for the next four months of his imprisonment, the priest must remember the words he had written to the Jesuit novices: ‘Whenever we look into the mirror (of Christ’s example) we see clearly that the temptation of no pleasure, the fear of no pain, should pluck us from the arms of such a master’. After four days in Little Ease he was secretly taken to Leicester House. The Queen herself was there. She, with the earls of Leicester and Bedford, received him with all honour and courtesy, told him they found no fault with him except that he was a papist—‘Which’, he replied, ‘is my greatest glory’—and offered him his life, his liberty, riches and honours if he would renounce his religion and become a protestant. Refusing the bribe, he was returned to the Tower. Five days later Leicester and Burleigh signed the warrant to put him to the torture. On July 31st he was racked. Largely by their own measures the lords of the council had made Campion the most talked-of man in the country; their purpose now was to discredit his character and lessen his *prestige*. It was proclaimed from all the London pulpits that Campion was about to recant at Paul’s Cross. The event belied that rumour.

Burleigh had a more successful stratagem. He poured out order upon order to county sheriffs and officials to arrest one Catholic gentleman after another, who, so each order alleged, by Campion’s own confession had entertained him in their houses. The trick succeeded at first. Consternation fell on the Catholics; even Protestants condemned such treachery. Mr Thomas Pounce,

impetuous as ever, bribed a keeper to deliver a note of reproach to the prisoner who wrote in answer that 'he had discovered no things of secret, nor would he, come rack, come rope'. It was said that he had admitted being present at certain houses when he saw the government already possessed sure knowledge of the fact, and for this frailty he asked pardon of the Catholics. Among these the suspicion that Campion's pretended confessions were forgeries became conviction when the government repeatedly refused to confront him with those he was said to have accused, and after they heard his repudiation of any betrayal of his brethren at his public disputation in the Tower. This debate was arranged to diminish Campion's intellectual reputation. On September 1st, after a second racking, he was summoned to dispute in theology against the deans of Windsor and of St Paul's. The council, deriving no satisfaction from the results, now adopted the course of slandering his patriotism. A third time he was racked, and more cruelly than ever, to extract some sort of confession that he had plotted against the queen. It was all in vain.

The council having failed to implicate Campion in any real conspiracy, it remained still possible to suborn false witness to prove him to have engaged in an imaginary one. Campion was the man in whose behalf the policy was invented—a policy that made many later Catholic martyrs. The Council forged a plot, and in accordance with their forgery drew up an indictment to the effect that Allen, Morton, Persons and Campion had made conspiracy to kill the queen, stir up rebellion, and procure foreign invasion of England. As an afterthought were added the names of all the other priests they happened to have in prison; in the margin of the paper of indictment the thirteen names were inserted: 'James Bosgrave, William, Filby, Thomas Ford, Thomas Cottam, Lawrence Richardson, John Collyton, Ralph Sherwin, Luke Kirby, Robert Johnson, Edward Rushton, Alexander Briant, Henry Orton, a civilian and—Short'.

Arraigned in mid-November, all pleaded 'not guilty', Sherwin adding: 'The plain reason of our standing here is our religion, not treason'. On November 20th in Westminster Hall Campion was the chief spokesman for all the prisoners at a trial in which, says Hallam in his *Constitutional History*, 'The prosecution was as unfairly conducted and supported by so slender evidence, as any,

perhaps, that can be found in our books'. The compliant jury gave its verdict of 'guilty'.

*Lord Chief Justice:* Campion and the rest, what can you say that you should not die?

*Campion:* It was not our death that ever we feared. But we knew that we were not lords of our own lives, and therefore, for want of answer would not be guilty of our own deaths. The only thing we now have to say is, that if our religion do make us traitors, we are worthy to be condemned; but otherwise are and have been as true subjects as ever the queen had. In condemning us you condemn all your own ancestors—all the ancient priests, bishops and kings—all that was once the glory of England, the island of saints, and the most devoted child of the see of Peter. For what have we taught, however you may qualify it with the odious name of treason, that they did not uniformly teach? To be condemned with these old lights—not of England only but of the world—by their degenerate descendants, is both gladness and glory to us. God lives; posterity will live; their judgment is not so liable to corruption as that of those who are now going to sentence us to death.

The sentence was passed.

On December 1st 1581, Campion, Sherwin and Briant came forth from the Tower to be dragged to Tyburn and there hanged, drawn and quartered. Looking cheerfully around on the vast crowd assembled, Campion saluted them: 'God save you, gentlemen! God bless you and make you all good Catholics.' To effect that had been his mission, and for that also he died.



## ST AMBROSE, A CONTEMPLATIVE

By PAX

I CAN never quite forgive St Jerome for being so cutting about St Ambrose's Latin. It seems to my ignorant mind that his Latin is only the shell of the kernel of the good nut within. Take at random, the homily for the sixth Sunday after Pentecost, almost at once, one finds this: 'The food of heavenly grace is



given, not to the idle, not in the city or to those accustomed to worldly dignity, but in desert places, to those who seek Christ. For Christ receives the humble, and the word of God speaks with them, not of worldly things, but of the kingdom of God.'

How wonderful is the next passage as a preparation for confession, for communion, or for, perhaps, a near-convert on the threshold of the Church: 'None receives the food of Christ unless he be first healed, and those who are invited are healed by the very call. If a man were lame, he received the power to walk, so that he might come. If he were deprived of the light of his eyes, he could not enter the house of the Lord, unless his sight were restored.' Or this: 'The five loaves are like milk, but the more solid meat is the body of Christ; the stronger drink is the blood of the Lord.'

How limpid his teaching on the sacraments. 'The sacraments have come from heaven whence comes all counsel. Perhaps thou sayest, "my bread is ordinary bread". But this bread is bread only before the sacramental words are spoken. When the consecration takes place, the bread becomes the body of Christ. How . . .? By consecration. What are the words used at the consecration, and by whom spoken? . . . The words are those of the Lord Jesus, and were spoken by him . . . when the consecration of the venerable sacrament takes place, the priest no longer uses his own words, but the words of Christ. . . . Seest thou how powerful is the word of Christ? . . . Which dost thou think is greater, manna from heaven, or the body of Christ? Without doubt, the body of Christ, since he is the maker of heaven. "They who did eat the manna are dead: he who shall eat this body, it shall be to him remission of sins, and he shall not die forever." Not idly, then, dost thou say "Amen", when thou receivest it, already confessing in spirit that it is the body of Christ that thou art about to receive. The priest says to thee, "the body of Christ" and thou sayest "Amen", that is, "It is true". What thy tongue confesses, let thy heart hold fast.'

He has a gentle sense of humour and is apt to poke fun at the foibles of his hearers, turning the tables adroitly, first in favour of virginity, then in favour of the matrons who locked up their marriageable daughters, lest St Ambrose's eloquence give them a religious vocation; or again, in favour of widows.

St Ambrose, naturally enough, for he was a patrician, was not as hard on the rich as are some of the saints, but he courteously puts them in their place, a very humble one in God's sight: 'Let us return to the rich, but kindly . . . for we do not wish to offend them, as we should like, if possible, to heal all'. He leaves them no doubt as to their being ill, and in need of healing. 'Let the rich know that the fault does not lie in abundance, but in those who know not how to use the abundance rightly, for though riches are a hindrance to the wicked, to good men they are an aid to virtue. Zacheus assuredly was rich, yet he was chosen by Christ. He had not yet seen Christ, but merited the title of "little".' That word 'merited' is worth noticing, as is also the 'little'. St Teresa of Lisieux would surely find a spiritual kinship with St Ambrose.

He seems not to be able to see any earthly thing without immediately seeing its heavenly counterpart. If he, too, descends to the multitude, it is because he always ascends with our Lord and the apostles. He cannot see a tree without perceiving the tree of the cross, and even a very grasping little sinner, intent on having the best view at the cheapest vantage-point by climbing a tree, at once evokes another tree and another man. 'And so he saw Zacheus raised on high.' And like his Lord, he knows how to draw an undreamed-of best from the worst defect of the most sinful sinner, and his confidence is always justified, and Zacheus truly preaches openly from his leafy pulpit; St Ambrose, indeed, seems to have a secret preference for the go-getting sinner who climbed, rather than for the just Nathaniel who 'defended the Lord in secret'; how splendid his conclusion: 'Nathaniel was under the tree, that is to say, upon the root, for he was a just man; and the root indeed was holy. He was under the tree, because he was under the law. Zacheus was high in the tree, for he was above the law. . . . The former had looked for Christ till then in the law, but the latter, being even then above the law, gave all he had and followed the Lord.' (Book 8 on Luke.)

If St Ambrose through sinful man sees always the sinless Man, the saviour, he sees always in woman, weeping the death wrought by sin, another Woman, whose tears bring healing, as witness his sermon on the widow of Naim. 'We may well believe that this widow, surrounded by a crowd . . . stands for something more than a woman, whose tears earned for her the resurrection of this young man, her only son . . . Thou shalt rise from the tomb, if

thou wilt listen to the word of God. And if thy sin be so grievous that thou canst not wash thyself with the tears of penitence, let thy mother the Church weep for thee, for she pleads for each one, as a widowed mother her only son.' He might well have been thinking of St Monica and St Augustine at that moment. That 'only son' echoes always that other only Son.

St Ambrose, although he was born in the year 340 and died in the year 397, is always modern, for holy scripture for him is always transparent of the eternal providence of God. He does not read it as a mere recital of past events, but as it were transposes them from the focus of God's views for us. Thus, when he talks of Simeon's receiving the holy child into his arms in the temple, it is not only Simeon that he sees, but each one of us, ever seeking our Saviour, that he may be renewed in Christ. He sees each of us enmeshed in the consciousness of our own failure, yet ever hoping: 'Let him who wishes to depart, come into the temple', the temple that each one is, 'come to Jerusalem'—that is the Church—'let him await the Christ . . . and let him receive in his hands the Word of God'. But St Ambrose's contemplation overflows into his daily life, for he continues: 'Let him lay hold on him by his works and with the arms of his faith. Then he will depart, as one who shall not see death, for he has seen him, who is Life.' (On Luke, Book 2, Ch. 2.)



## GAMALIEL

ED. And have you got the soul all nicely buttoned up, Gamaliel?

GAM. I beg your pardon?

ED. You know, the soul-theory, soul and spirit; we broached a question on it last time, and left it to be dealt with this time.

GAM. Oh, that. But what makes you think I think the soul is something you can button up, and presumably put on and take off, like the skin of Kipling's archetypal and 'just-so' rhinoceros?

ED. Come off it, man. It's an expression, the way one talks nowadays, up-to-date, contemporary.



GAM. Oh, I see, like mixed metaphors. But look here, I thought it was *I* who had to urge *you* to be contemporary, not the other way round.

ED. Perhaps the printer has mixed our lines up, and I am really you, and you are really me.

GAM. You mean we have buttoned on the wrong souls? But modern or not—and I must say the phrase sounds as dated to me as prang or prune and handlebar moustaches—I do think it is a thoroughly misleading metaphor to talk about buttoning up the soul. It conjures up a worse picture than the ghost in the machine, and that is a picture we must never, never, have any truck with whatsoever.

ED. No no no no NO! When I said 'Have you got the soul buttoned up', I meant 'Have you got your thoughts, your ideas, concepts, etc., etc., about the soul buttoned up?' I meant soul in inverted commas—the word or idea, not the thing.

GAM. Ah, the word, not the thing. Well, that was a very enlightening little confusion, Ed, because I don't think it is any good our discussing what the thing, soul, is—discussing soul-theories, in other words, while there is such a tremendous muddle in people's minds, as one finds among both believers and unbelievers alike, about what the word 'soul' means.

ED. I'm not sure that I agree with you there. You get a vast difference of opinion about what the soul is—or rather whether there is such a thing; but everybody agrees that the word has a definite religious meaning as—

GAM. A religious meaning! As the immortal spiritual element in man, or something like that, eh? That is precisely my complaint. 'Soul' has no business to be treated as a purely religious word. Perhaps I shouldn't have talked about muddle about what the word means. Perhaps you are right, and nearly everybody is agreed, so that there is almost universal misunderstanding and misuse of the word; the result being that it is practically impossible to think and talk straight about the reality.

ED. Many people deny there is any such reality.

GAM. Not the reality I want the word to signify; not the reality signified by the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin words normally translated 'soul'; not the reality which I am willing to bet our Anglo-Saxon ancestors had in mind when they used their Anglo-Saxon equivalent of 'soul'. People would no more think of

saying that they don't believe there is such a thing as soul in that sense, than they would dream of saying they don't believe there is such a thing as weather, or they are very doubtful whether there is such a thing as life, or as passion, or as energy, or as gravity.

ED. But these are all words which have more or less immediate reference to elementary and universal experience.

GAM. And so, my dear boy, ought 'soul' to be. There is an elementary and universal experience that some things in this world are alive and some are not. And we call the things that are alive, from microbes and fungi to elephants and men, 'animate', and the things that are not alive we call 'inanimate'; which two words being interpreted literally from Latin into English, we could say—and ought to say—that living things are 'ensouled', and non-living things are 'unensouled'. That is what the word 'soul' means, the difference between living and non-living things. To put it more positively, you can say it means the principle of life.

ED. You seem to be making it almost a biological concept.

GAM. But of course. That is precisely what it ought to be—as biological a word as 'heart' or 'blood' or 'liver' or 'digestion'. And what's more, it is a word that is very necessary to the biologists, and one of which they have been robbed by the thoughtless spiritual writers of the last few centuries, who have treated 'soul' as an esoteric religious concept, which is the speciality of the very devout, something that needs guidance from spiritual directors.

ED. I'm sorry to hear you don't believe in spiritual direction. I had an article on the necessity of it last month.

GAM. I never said I don't believe in spiritual direction. But it is people, men and women, that need to get it, not souls. It is men and women who are commanded to be perfect like their Father in heaven, and whom our Lord came to save, not souls.

ED. The word 'soul' occurs pretty frequently in the new testament, doesn't it? Are you going to tell me that in the new testament it never means more than life-force, or the difference between living and non-living things?

GAM. I am going to tell you that it is no more religious a word in the new testament, and probably rather less, than 'body', 'flesh', 'man', 'people'. I challenge you to find me one text where 'soul' means what it is commonly taken to mean nowa-

days, namely the religiously involved, immortal part of man, to the exclusion of his secular aspects and life.

ED. That is a rather sweeping description of the modern meaning, but let it pass. Let me see; what about this? 'Come to me all you that labour . . . and learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart; and you shall find rest to your souls' (Matt. xi, 29). Or this from I Peter ii, 11: 'Refrain yourselves from carnal desires which war against the soul'; and again from the same epistle (ii, 25): 'But you are now converted to the shepherd and bishop of your souls'.

GAM. I agree they are easy to take in the modern way; but to do so is to mistake them, and consequently to miss some of their full meaning. Of course the biblical meaning of the word is not usually precise and clear cut, and it shifts about a little. So it should; living words do. But the centre of its orbit is always the common experience of *life*. Often indeed our English translations have to put 'life' for the 'soul' words of the Greek and Latin originals. Thus in the sermon on the mount (Matt, vi, 25), our Lord says, putting 'soul' for the corresponding 'soul' word of the original, 'Therefore I say to you, be not solicitous for your *soul*, what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the *soul* more than the meat, and the body more than the raiment?' Or take this saying of our Lord's, and see what heretical nonsense it makes of your modern meaning of 'soul': 'He that findeth his *soul* shall lose it; and he that shall LOSE HIS SOUL FOR ME shall find it'. How do you like that doctrine?

ED. I grant quite willingly it means life in these instances; I approve the standard translation. But—

GAM. But it doesn't simply mean life in these cases, and something else in others. In these cases it means life in a total sense, including and not separate from your religious implications. And in your instances it has a more restricted reference to life in some of its more particular manifestations.

ED. Could you translate my first instance ' . . . you shall find rest to your *lives*'?

GAM. No, I don't think you could. But you could translate it 'you shall find rest to yourselves'. This is a common Hebrew poetic idiom—and we are dealing with a distinctly poetic utterance of our Lord's. 'My soul' is just a rather emphatic and solemn way of saying 'I', or 'myself'—you get this usage frequently in



the psalms. And what is *myself*, precisely? Why, surely, it is what I experience as the living me. Incidentally, the Hebrews had another way of using 'soul' that it is not so easy to find an English equivalent for, as the principle, or subject, of that particular manifestation of life which we call appetite or emotion. They talk about the soul being hungry and thirsty, and they said about manna in the wilderness, after they had been eating it day in day out for several years, 'Our soul loathes this very light food'. There is something of that meaning too, I think, in this saying of our Lord's.

ED. Well, I think you convince me; even those uses of the word in I Peter would seem to have a wider sort of background than 'soul' has in modern English. But it's all very well your saying what 'soul' ought to mean. We are still faced with the fact of its usual meaning in modern English.

GAM. A most unfortunate fact, which makes the word useless not only for biology but also for theology. It prevents the theologian from putting across very important truths about man and human life for which he has traditionally used the word 'anima'. 'Soul' has become as theologically useless, to all intents and purposes, as the words 'fairy' or 'leprechaun'; and more dangerously so, because it is not generally recognized for what it is, a dead word. I think we should scrap it, and translate 'anima' by some such word as 'life-principle', ugly and artificial though it is.

ED. So much for 'soul' then. But I believe the questioner asked us to explain the difference between 'soul' and 'spirit'.

GAM. And we were also requested to define 'mind'. We are still, I presume, concerned with the words, not the things.

ED. I would say that 'mind' is the easiest and least controversial of the trio.

GAM. Yes, I think it is—and also the most living, in the sense that it has a universally recognized reference to common experience, the common experience of thought.

ED. So we could define it as the capacity for thought. But that is not its only, or even its primary, meaning. Could you, after all, define it as capacity for thought in the sentence 'I have half a mind to thrash you'?

GAM. There it signifies actual purposive thought. And it also often means something like memory, as the verb 'to mind' means

'remember' in Scotch. But the fact that these meanings are primary merely illustrates the truth that activity words come before capacity words. But its commonest modern meaning is, surely, the capacity for thought.

ED. Synonymous with 'intellect' then, or 'the understanding'?

GAM. No, not quite. Those are more specialized words, more sophisticated words. Though thought is the principal activity of the mind, you can do more than just think or understand with it. (We are still only talking about the word, all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding.) You can make it up, for example, which signifies will, determination, purpose. You can also have such unintellectual things as hunches with it. St Augustine used the Latin word *mens* to include the functions of memory, understanding, and will; in a word, for the spiritual part of the soul.

ED. That last statement seems to me to beg a great many questions, questions of realities, not just words. It assumes that mind is the factor that distinguishes man from other animals, and it qualifies it metaphysically as 'spirit'.

GAM. Granted. But it shows the range of meaning of the word, not synonymous indeed with thought or the thinking capacity, but centred on it, rather as the various meanings of 'soul', before the word's religious destruction, were centred on life and living capacity. And it also introduces us to our third word, 'spirit'.

ED. Perhaps we could say that while 'soul' is, or at least ought to be, basically a biological or physics word, 'spirit' is basically a metaphysical word, signifying whatever is immaterial or incorporeal.

GAM. That is certainly a legitimate use of it; but one I am inclined to distrust, because it is remote from experience, and tends to disguise the fact that when one is talking about the *immaterial* or *incorporeal* one is talking negatively, i.e. qualifying one's experience language by negation.

ED. How would you relate so rarefied a notion as spirit to experience?

GAM. Well, there is at least the possibility of rarefied experience. Consider such expressions as 'high spirits', 'a man of spirit', 'a spirited defence'. It signifies, to speak very loosely, a sort of psychic plus quantity, something that is not precisely of the essence or nature of a living being, of man in particular, but is shown in an excess, or superabundance of vitality.

ED. So you think the name of this journal means 'The life of the superabundant vitality'?

GAM. If it means anything, it should mean 'The superabundant life', the sort of life that our Lord came 'that they may have it more abundantly'.

ED. Yes, I am prepared to accept that. It would seem, then, that rather than being basically metaphysical, 'spirit' is first and foremost a value word, perhaps even a religious word, unlike the unhappy word 'soul'.

GAM. I think that is certainly true of its use in scripture, the new testament in particular. If one presses the word back, of course, one comes to its connection with, or derivation from, words meaning breath or wind. Hence its application to the experience of vitality, or volatile and invisible energy. Such energy can, to be sure, be good or bad, and there are plenty of evil spirits in scripture. But if it is not primarily an ethical value word, it is certainly a power value word. And supreme power being God's, you get the cardinal application of it to the Spirit of God.

ED. But when St Paul talks about the spiritual man, or contrasts the works of the flesh with the fruits of the spirit, it surely has an ethical value there.

GAM. I think that makes it altogether too pedestrian. The spiritual man is one who is in possession of, or rather possessed by, the Spirit of God. The fruits of the spirit are the fruits of the Spirit with a capital S, the Spirit manifesting his presence in the true believer, through the Christ-like life the true believer lives.

ED. In any case 'spirit' in the new testament does not signify simply one constitutive element in man, so that we can say that man is a complex of 'body, soul, and spirit'. 'Spirit' signifies a quality of soul, or rather of man, body and soul together, a quality given by God. Could you identify spirit with what we nowadays call grace?

GAM. I think you could. Not that the words have precisely the same meaning; but I think I would agree that they differ, not so much in signifying different realities, as in signifying different aspects of the same reality, which is what St Peter calls a participation in the divine nature, or in the life of God. 'Grace' signifies first the gratuitousness of this reality, its being *given* us by God *gratis*, and is then defined (if we mean sanctifying grace) as a quality or habit of the soul—i.e. of the 'life element' in man. 'Spirit' on



the other hand signifies the vitality, the verve and *élan* of this reality, and also its absolutely supernatural quality as coming from, and being an assimilation to, a possession of, the Holy Spirit.

ED. Well, I hope that satisfies our questioner, because I don't think we have time for more. Other questioners, I am afraid, will have to go unsatisfied.

GAM. On this topic I would just like to say one thing more. You mentioned the contrast between spirit and flesh, spiritual and carnal. It is most important, I am sure you will agree, to realize that the pair spirit-flesh are not in the least synonymous with the pair soul-body. Spirit and flesh, as used in the new testament, state values, soul and body state entities. So you can get a spiritual soul and a carnal soul—indeed 'soul', and words deriving from it, is sometime used as a value term *synonymous* with flesh; and besides a carnal body you also get a spiritual body—which is a concept that is absolutely necessary for making any sense at all of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

ED. Thank you, Gamaliel. And may I say that besides being sometimes quite instructive, it has been great fun knowing you? Goodbye.



## REVIEWS

SON AND SAVIOUR: The Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Scriptures. A Symposium translated by Anthony Wheaton. (Geoffrey Chapman; 12s. 6d.)

Instead of an armoury of proof-texts, the authors of these five articles (which first appeared in *Lumière et Vie* in April 1953) present an unfolding realization of Christ; discovery rather than demonstration is their key-note. The development is traced in the scriptures, but Fr Gelin warns us that '... the announcement of a new religious dimension to mankind is not simply a hard material fact. It must be lived before it can be adequately proclaimed' (p. 15). The patient reader will find his reward, but not in 'nice knock-down arguments'. The Messiah-King, Servant of Yahweh, Son of Man are various expressions of a hope which converges on a meeting with God in 'the last days'. Belief in the divine status of the risen Jesus, proclaimed in the early preaching as Lord and Saviour, was, as Fr Schmitt shows in his chapter on the apostolic Church, secondary, in a sense, to this theme of the inauguration of 'the last days'; the Lord reigns, raised

up by God, he possesses glory, power and dominion as the Messiah-King, the 'anointed servant'. Further penetration into the mystery through the titles 'Son of God' and 'Son of Man' is traced by Fr Benoit, O.P., in a chapter on the synoptic gospels. He recognizes that of itself the title 'Son of God' would have been unequal to conveying a claim of natural sonship, so hard for the Jew to grasp, but it was open to fulfilment in a divine sense by Jesus' unique relation to the Father. 'Son of Man', in contrast, already evoked a transcendent personality in the light of Daniel and the later apocalyptic literature; the heavenly origin of this bringer of justice and salvation would have prepared its hearers for the pre-existence of Christ, the eschatological Judge. Fr Boismard, O.P., resolves the apparent conflict between St Paul's stress on the resurrection and exaltation of Christ 'above every name' after his death and his divine pre-existence. An explicit connection is to be found between the title of 'Lord' given to him at his enthronement and the creative power which is his from eternity; if he rules in glory and power, it is because he is 'before every creature' and 'all things were created through him and for him'. 'Christ', Fr Boismard concludes, 'is therefore "the image of the invisible God"', even as the Wisdom of God was, not only by reason of the glory which took possession of him on the day of his resurrection, but also because he is the Son, begotten of the Father before time began' (p. 109).

Fr Mollat, S.J., in a final chapter on St John's writings, sees his conception of divinity initially through the implications of 'glory': Christ as the ultimate manifestation of God, the Truth and the Life, fulfilling the types which foreshadowed him, judging because he is the measure of life. His nature and mission are indivisible, as the author rightly insists, and this unity finds a luminous expression in the fourth gospel; the Son of Man who is to be 'raised up' is also, in St John's words, 'the only Son' sent by the Father and in a mysterious way one with him, so that we have power to become 'children of God'. Although these themes are dwelt on with unparalleled penetration into the pre-existence of the Word and the intimacy of knowledge and love which is the divine life, the author can still point to a fundamental agreement with the synoptic writers 'complete on all essential points' (p. 148); the gospel remains rooted in history.

In a symposium of this kind there are inevitably repetitions, and the final chapter suffers more in this respect than the earlier ones, but even this has its advantages in a book of such density. The market-place apologist who is content to proclaim Christ will find here great riches, the riches of the scriptures themselves. OSMUND LEWRY, O.P.

THE TRIAL OF JESUS. By Josef Blinzler. Translated by Isabel and Florence McHugh. (Mercier Press; 30s.)

In recent months, from two quite different sources, attention has been drawn to the trial of our Lord; one was the protest from the Jewish authorities against the anti-semitic tone of the Passion Play at Oberammergau, the other was the play *A Man on Trial* which was produced in London and also in Edinburgh during the festival. In both we witness an attempt by the Jews to minimize their share in the condemnation of Christ. From the controversy thus aroused it is with a sense of gratitude that one turns to the scholarly work of Josef Blinzler for an authoritative analysis of this very question. If Jesus was innocent, and yet was pronounced guilty and executed, who was responsible? The author shows that disagreement can arise in this problem due to different assessments of the sources. What some regard as reliable tradition others reject, and there are wide variations in the interpretation of the Bible. Further, knowledge of the legal administration of Judea in the time of Jesus is only fragmentary. And a third source of disagreement comes from a failure to realize that the aim of many scholars was apologetic rather than purely historical.

Because the Jewish people have always been exercised to show that Jesus was legally and justly condemned to death, it becomes a fascinating adventure to follow Dr Blinzler, as he guides us with consummate learning through the intricacies of their arguments to a satisfying conclusion. He discusses who was responsible for the arrest of Jesus; then follow descriptions of the various phases of the trial up to the death sentence passed by Pilate. Blinzler sums up by saying that the main blame rested with the Jews, especially for their deliberate distortion of the charge against Jesus when they delivered him to Pilate, but the Romans must also take some blame since the death sentence was passed by both Jews and Romans.

Blinzler seems to go astray a little in discussing the text 'Thou wouldst have no power at all over me were it not given thee from above' (p. 232). He departs from the usual interpretation without giving any adequate reason for doing so, and makes out that Pilate was not free to act otherwise than as he did.

The account of the scourging and crucifixion, although described in simple scientific terms devoid of rhetorical embellishments, is a deeply moving record.

The physical cause of the death of Christ is fully discussed, and the opinions of many scripture scholars and doctors are reviewed. It is interesting to notice that there is still a small body of opinion in favour of the theory that rupture of the heart might have been the cause of death. It certainly explains three facts which must be accounted for:

(i) that Jesus uttered a loud cry and expired. The sudden intense pain of rupture of the heart would explain this, and death would follow immediately.



(ii) that blood and water flowed from the pierced side of Christ, showing that the blood had separated into its two component parts. This was much more likely to occur if the blood had escaped from the cavities of the heart.

(iii) that the blood and water flowed out immediately the side was pierced. This seems to indicate that the fluids were under some sort of pressure immediately behind the chest wall. As soon as the pleural cavity was opened the lung would collapse, and air would be sucked in rather than fluid expressed, unless the clotted blood was under pressure in the pericardial sac. And the only happening which could explain this would be that the heart had ruptured and pumped the blood through the rupture into the pericardium.

Against this view, most medical authorities regard rupture of the heart in a healthy young man as practically unknown. Yet again the physical and mental sufferings of Christ were so unique that the possibility that he died of a broken heart still remains.

It is impossible to praise too highly this very important book which surpasses all other works in this field. The author covers an immense literature, writes with great lucidity and brings to his task such deep scholarship that this volume must become the standard work of reference for years ahead.

J. RYLAND WHITAKER, S.J.

LETTRES LETTRES AUX FRATERNITÉS. By René Voillaume, Prior of the Little Brothers of Jesus. (Cerf; Vol. I, 12 NF. Vol. II, 9.60 NF.)

It is possible that the work of Père Voillaume be seen as little more than a reaction to the *embourgeoiser* tendency so apparent in religious institutions. If it were it would be valuable but it is something far greater. Père Voillaume's ideal is that of living the Christian life to the full, that is regarding it as fundamentally contemplative, whilst at the same time submitting to the hardest physical conditions, in home and work, that the poor have to suffer in the world. It is an attempt to join the extremes and so at the same time to embrace all that lies in between.

It is for religious with these ideals, whose life is otherwise characterized by adoration before the blessed sacrament, the small community of three to five, wage-earning, and a particular stress on simplicity and friendship, that Père Voillaume writes. His first book, *Au Coeur des Masses*, the greater part of which was translated into *The Seeds of the Desert*, was a general approach to the life, dealing with the need for it in the present-day world and with some of the difficulties which its following obviously involves. The two volumes of *Lettres aux Fraternités* are both in the same vein, the first dealing with matters which from the accumulated experience of the fraternities demand special attention, such as obedience to vocation, the universal character of

charity, prayer, obedience to the Church, etc.; and the second being as it were the collection of the chapter talks of a prior to his brethren on the major themes of their life. In the second volume there are over a hundred of these addresses, mostly just a couple of pages long, written in all parts of the world between 1949 and 1960.

Reading these letters is a living experience, for not only are they the outcome of Père Voillaume's thought on the ideals of the congregation but they have been produced in response to the particular needs of the time, and consequently, through the binding of the ideal to the immediate and practical, one is presented with a very real sense of urgency and vitality. However, though these letters are often related to particular needs they have a permanent relevance and it is for this reason that they are now being published for use in the fraternities.

Similarly the reader can easily transpose the thought of Père Voillaume from the particular context of the Little Brothers to his own. To the religious these letters are bound to be of value; perhaps though it is to the layman who is trying to live a full Christian life in the world that will be most helpful. Whereas many religious institutions have particular ends the fulfilling of which is always before them, the Little Brother deliberately undertakes work which is not directly organized for the needs of the Church or the active apostolate. Thus the layman whose job so often seems sterile and remote from his faith should find what Père Voillaume writes for his brethren most helpful to himself. It is a shame that as yet they have not appeared in English. S.C.

FUNDAMENTAL MARRIAGE COUNSELING: A Catholic viewpoint. By John R. Cavanagh, M.D., and others. (Mercier Press; 30s.)

THE CATHOLIC MARRIAGE MANUAL. By George A. Kelly. (Robert Hale; 21s.)

Mgr Kelly and Dr Cavanagh have both done important work in America towards putting the findings and techniques of modern empirical psychology and sociology at the service of the pastoral work of the Church. It is good to see their books being made more easily available here by publication in England or Ireland. (Mercier Press have done a particularly good job in producing a book of 568 pages for thirty shillings.) But both books would have benefited from a little revision of the text. The bibliographies and references, for example, are entirely American, even books originally published in Britain being referred to in the American edition.

*Fundamental Marriage Counseling* is designed to provide reliable and easily accessible information for the counsellor about fields in which he is not professionally qualified. More than half the book is devoted to the physical factors in marriage, the remainder to 'social aspects' (divorce, canon and civil law, economic problems, mixed



marriages and alcoholism) and to the religious aspects (four chapters out of thirty-four). The work is very well done, so far as it goes: the material facts about marriage are presented clearly, by competent specialists. But there is hardly anything about the specifically human, *personal* relationships involved—between husband and wife, between parents and children, with relatives and friends—or about the counseling process itself. Dr Cavanagh says in his Introduction, 'In this book we do not attempt to cover all the aspects. . . . We hope to review other relationships in a later volume.' It is a pity this is not indicated in the title, nor in the Foreword, which claims that '*Fundamental Marriage Counseling* represents a balanced, whole, integrated volume'.

*The Catholic Marriage Manual* is a more 'popular' work: 'sixteen easy-to-read, fact-filled chapters', says the dust-cover. Mgr Kelly, who is the author of the important study *Catholics and the Practice of the Faith*, occasionally makes telling use of statistics to point the dangers of alcoholism, divorce, or mixed marriages, but for the most part he relies here on the techniques of the journalist. ('A veteran divorce court judge, John A. Sharbaro of Chicago, was asked by a newspaper reporter what, in his experience, was the most frequent cause of broken marriages. Without hesitation, Judge Sharbaro answered, "Drink".') But this is a comprehensive, frank and practical book, and should be useful to many. A.G.

NO PIOUS PERSON: Herbert Kelly, S.S.M. (autobiographical recollections). Ed. George Every, S.S.M. (Faith Press; 15s. od.)

Some time or other Anglicans had to come to grips with Herbert Kelly: he was that sort of person—nagging, provocative, irritating, interesting. A biographer would be struggling the whole time not to lose his temper, not to be too enthusiastic, not to lose his grip on this Proteus as he becomes now an exciting visionary, now an indifferent philosopher, sometimes professedly the humblest of men, and so often a self-conscious showman. Obviously it was the duty of the order he founded, the Society of the Sacred Mission, to choose the time for exhibition: he would have been a hundred this year and the celebrations have already begun. There has been a special service from Kelham on TV, Roger Lloyd spread his enthusiasm over the best part of one of the *Guardian's* (Manchester) pages. *Prism*, a new and lively Anglican magazine, carried an excellent article by Gordon Phillips, and now we have this collection of Fr Kelly's writings arranged neatly into a kind of autobiography by George Every.

It was a wise decision to let the man speak for himself; assessing him is no easy task. Nobody who has seen Kelham could feel convinced by Roger Lloyd's article. David Paton's introduction to this book is much more interesting, but necessarily one-sided. It will be



interesting to see what his own community say about him; it would not be like them to shirk the whole picture. For the time being, one imagines, this nobbly, noisy, frightening old man still shuffles too vividly through the memories of the Kelham Fathers to permit a thorough assessment.

It was a courageous decision, too, for Fr Kelly's style is hardly engaging. His tortuous self-analysis leaves an unpleasant taste. His philosophical puzzling seems to thrive on false paradoxes: he craves for the dilemma like an addict for his drug. When many of his shocking questions are analysed and seen to be no more than verbal confusions one tends to lose confidence in the thoroughness of his theology. Then there is a lack of charm in his style. It is almost inhuman at times. He plans the religious life, almost, it seems, as a machine for getting something done, rather than a life to be delighted in. How very different he was from his brother; but that is another story.

For those who persevere, this book can be most illuminating. Why is it such a useful guide to Anglicanism today? Can it be that this voice from the beginning of the century has been listened to? It does seem to be so, for Fr Kelly was essentially a practical man, he got things done. He may have been hopeless with people, but he founded a thriving order. He laboured the inadequacy of seminary training, but he gave his order his kind of seminary which has been feeding the Anglican ministry liberally ever since. He denounced sectarianism, and the High Church movement followed his lead and is now taking an active part in the ecumenical movement. It is difficult to think of another Anglican in this century who has had a comparable influence on the Church of England today.

C.B.



## MUSIC

**A** MOST important release is Decca's E.P. disc (CEP 654) of Benjamin Britten's *Missa Brevis* sung, with skill and fluency, by the *Boys of Westminster Cathedral Choir* with *George Malcolm* at the organ. The recording was made whilst an actual service was in progress. Britten is seldom less than vital or compelling and this recent setting, specially commissioned, reveals him not only as a felicitous craftsman and sincere musician—qualities which do not necessarily go hand-in-glove every time—but, primarily, as a dedicated worker in the specialized field of religious music. Therein lies the composer's worth. From the Westminster choir's angle his *Missa* is tailor-made and, from almost any standpoint, it is an outstanding contribution to the music of the Church—and, needless to say, a great step forward from the

strictures of nineteenth-century convention. The *Agnus Dei*, to take but one example, is a unique piece of imagery—surely as striking in its way as anything written by Byrd or his contemporaries over three centuries ago?

Owen Brannigan is a past master in the art of 'putting a song across'. This skill is a necessary adjunct of course to folk-song, and, on H.M.V. 7 EG8521 (45 r.p.m.), he gives us a batch of *Traditional Carols*. The calypso rhythm of Jamaica's *De Blessed Virgin had a baby boy* produces a spontaneous outburst of joy and gives Ernest Lush, at the piano, an opportunity for displaying his strongly-developed rhythmic sense. From France comes *The Ballad of Jesus Christ*, considerably more subdued in its mode of expression, and from England a number of favourites including a *Cheshire Souling Song* (still sung by the children of those parts between All Souls' Day and Christmastide), the Northumbrian *Dame get up and bake your pies* and the almost ubiquitous, but always fascinating, *Twelve Days of Christmas*. In similar vein to this is Barrie Grayson's *Shepherd Boy's Song*, a cheery, lilting little carol with an irresistible melody. All in all Mr Brannigan has recorded an engaging group.

Cantata also has a seasonal offering on T72067F (45 r.p.m.), and here a batch of *European Carols* (Hungarian, Polish, English, Italian, Russian and French) provides some fresh examples of Christmas music alongside two well-established favourites. The choral tone satisfies.

Robert Kobler, no ordinary organist, plays *In Dulci Jubilo*, *Puer Natus in Bethlehem* and other Bach pieces (similarly appropriate) on T71879F, whilst some Bach arrangements of solo songs from Schemelli's *Musikalisches Gesang-Buch of 1736* are found in dependable performances on T72073F.

The most recent releases from Cantata offer further diversions from the customary repertory and will again please the musician whose tastes, whilst not necessarily extravagant, may not always follow a set course.

T72087F, for instance, contains excellent performances of Schütz's *O quam tu pulchra es* and *Veni de Libano* which point out, all too forcibly, our appalling neglect—and even ignorance—of this not insignificant composer. Helmut Krebs and Roland Kunz (tenor and baritone) give persuasive, highly-polished performances with the unobtrusive collaboration of an instrumental ensemble.

T71691N has four *Sacred Songs* by the *Hessische Kantorei* whose singing has a bloom and a mainly full, musically unadulterated, tone.

WILLIAM VARCOE